

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending, claims 4-8 and 11-13 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 is amended herein.

The specification has been objected to because of a minor informality. The specification has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to read 2C, rather than 2B. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

The figures have been objected to. Figure 3B has been amended to add the legend – Prior Art--. The figures have also been objected to as not showing the “one optical element” and the “polarizer.” As described in the specification, paragraphs 0061 and 0077, the polarizer and optical element for defining an angular intensity distribution respectively comprise portions of the illumination system. The illumination system is shown as IL in Fig. 1, therefore Applicants respectfully submit that there is no need to amend the drawings. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim 16 is objected to as lacking proper antecedent basis in certain of its terms. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 15, thereby providing antecedent basis for the term “said diaphragm.” Claim 16 has further been amended to correct the typographical error in the word “polarizer” and to strike the words “the or” in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 1-3, 9 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claims 1, 18 and 20 obviate the rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the recited rectilinear intensity distribution is at a pupil plane of the illumination system as described, for example, in paragraph [0061] of the specification. As described in the specification, the rectangular illumination radiation profile provides various effects and features that differ from standard circular radiation profiles. The Tanaka reference is not in any way directed to this feature, or even illumination modes. In contrast, the portion of Tanaka relied upon in the office action simply teaches a rectangular field stop 107 that ensures that a rectangular portion 111 of the mask 8 is illuminated. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 9 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 10, and 14-16 are each rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Tanaka in combination with Inoue, Orino or Nishi. Without conceding the teachings of any of these references, or whether any of the asserted combinations are proper, applicants submit that

HANSEN ET AL. -- 10/816,190  
Client/Matter: 081468-0309021

none of the references overcome the deficiencies of Tanaka set out above. Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claims 10 and 14-16 be withdrawn.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



ROBERT C. PEREZ  
Reg. No. 39328  
Tel. No. 703.770.7759  
Fax No. 703.770.7901

RCP/smm  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-7900

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

IN THE DRAWING(S):

The attached sheet(s) of drawing(s) includes changes to Figure 3B. This sheet replaces the original sheet showing Figure(s) 2A-4B.